



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,145	05/04/2001	Kenneth Mark Hunsinger	RSW920010001US1	9700
7590	01/11/2005		EXAMINER	
Geral R. Woods IBM Corporation T81/503 PO Box 12195 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			CAO, DIEM K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2126
		DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicant No.	Applicant(s)
	09/849,145	HUNSINGER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cao, Diem	2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter (U.S. 6,697,814 B1) in view of Sweeney et al. (U.S. 2002/0083168).

As to claim 1, Porter teaches receiving one or more events at the management system (event collection created...the event data; col. 8, lines 1-15), evaluating each received event to determine if an additional capability is available for the management system (Code-let builder examines one or more received event; col. 8, lines 1-49), and programmatically appending the additional capability to the event if so (adds executable code segments and additional data; col. 8, lines 1-49), thereby automatically and dynamically adapting the received events to the capabilities of the system without requiring changes to applications generating the events (Each service processing record...event data; col. 5, lines 1- 65). However, Porter does not teach the management system, Porter teaches a billing processing system (a billing processing system; col. 4, lines 63-67), and the actions could be billing action or finding and eliminating problems in the network (col. 7, lines 35-48).

Sweeney teaches the event management system (EMS; abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine the teachings of Porter and Sweeney because it provides a method to monitoring events generated on a distributed computer network.

As to claim 2, Porter teaches programmatically invoking processing of the appended additional capabilities (a record processor equipped to receive and process interpretables; col. 11, lines 56-67 and col. 19, lines 23-40).

As to claim 3, Porter teaches selected ones of the appended additional capabilities comprise a name of an executable task (methods or callable functions; col. 5, lines 5-17).

As to claim 4, Porter teaches selected ones of the appended additional capabilities comprise a name of an executable task (methods or callable functions; col. 5, lines 5-17) and wherein the programmatically invoking step comprises executing the task (Execution of the interpretable then proceeds; col. 19, lines 23-40).

As to claim 5, Porter teaches selected ones of the appended additional capabilities comprise a rule to be added to a rule base server (code-let building policy...method to be uploaded; col. 18, lines 31-52).

As to claim 6, Porter teaches selected ones of the appended additional capabilities comprise a rule to be evaluated by a rule base server and wherein the

programmatically invoking step comprises evaluation the rule by the rule base server (code-let building policy...method to be uploaded; col. 18, lines 31-52 and col. 19, lines 1-22).

As to claim 7, Porter teaches selected ones of the appended additional capabilities comprise a property name and value (A method section...upload indicator...retained in the library; col. 10, lines 43-53).

As to claim 8, Porter teaches selected ones of the appended additional capabilities comprise a property name and value (A method section...upload indicator...retained in the library; col. 10, lines 43-53) and wherein the programmatically invoking step comprises determining if a rule associated with that property name and value exists in a rule base and evaluation the rule if so (Execution of the interpretable then proceeds; col. 19, lines 1-40).

As to claim 9, Porter does not teach a flag indicates whether the appended additional capability for a selected has been processed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, the advantage of using flag in programming is well known, especially in the system of Porter, there are more than one functions/methods are added to the event collection, would be motivated to using flag in the implementation of the processing the events.

As to claim 10, Porter does not teach a precondition for the programmatically invoking step comprises determining whether an appended additional capability is present on a selected event, and determining that the appended additional capability has not already been performed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, the advantage of using flag in programming is well known, especially in the system of Porter, there are more than one functions/methods are added to the event collection, would be motivated to using flag in the implementations of the processing the events.

As to claim 11, Porter does not explicitly teach the programmatically appended further comprises adding a slot to a representation of the event. Porter teaches data and instructions are added, and the code-let can be implemented as object (col. 8, lines 1-15 and lines 50-60).

As to claim 12, Porter teaches the programmatically appending further comprises adding a property to an object representing the event (code-let 417 are created...serialized objects; col. 8, lines 50-60 and a method section...interpretable file; col. 10, lines 43-53).

As to claim 13, Porter teaches the programmatically appending further comprises adding a field to a representative of the event (adding data and instruction; col. 8, lines 1-15 and code-let 417 are created...serialized objects; col. 8, lines 50-60).

As to claims 14 and 20, they correspond to the method of claim 1 except they are a system and a computer product claim respectively.

As to claims 15 and 21, see rejection of claim 4 above.

As to claims 16 and 22, see rejection of claim 6 above.

As to claims 17 and 23, see rejection of claim 6 above.

As to claims 18 and 24, see rejection of claim 8 above.

As to claims 19 and 25, see rejection of claim 10 above.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/21/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants sole argument is that Porter fails to teach modifications of event records after they have been received at the record processors. This argument is unpersuasive based on the following reasoning. Referring to the claims as disclosed, i.e. claim 1, Applicant discloses the receiving of one or more events at the management system, evaluating the event to determine additional capabilities that are available for the event and automatically and dynamically appending those capabilities to the event.

The cited steps are all performed at the management system. Therefore, based on the claims a system that receives events and automatically and dynamically appends available capabilities to the received events is an event management system. Porter describes a network control service processor of a communications system that has a code-let builder and dispatcher, which receives events and appends available capabilities to the events for execution by the record processors. The control/service processor functions in the same manner as disclosed for the event management system as disclosed in the claims. Therefore, the examiner equates the processor to the event management system and maintains the rejection as disclosed above.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

January 5, 2005



LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER